

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 21, 2008. Claims 30-41 are presented for examination, of which Claims 30 and 34 are in independent form. Claims 30, 31, 34, and 35 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly, and Claims 40 and 41 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

On April 28, 2008, one of Applicants' attorneys conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner to discuss the features of Claim 30 and in particular to present arguments as to why the cited portions of the cited reference entitled "Olympus Digital Vision D-320L D-220L Digital Camera Instructions" (Olympus) are not believed to teach or suggest the features of Claim 30. Applicants' representative argued that the features of Claim 30 are not expressly or inherently found in *Olympus* and that the Examiner's understanding of those features is not in accord with the language of those claims. While no agreement was reached concerning the applicability of *Olympus* as a reference, Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's remarks in the Office Action dated March 21, 2007, and submit the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, which include both the arguments presented during the interview and further points, for his consideration.

Claims 30, 34, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Olympus*. Claims 31, 32, 35, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Olympus* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,349 (*Saegusa*); Claims 33 and 37 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Olympus* and *Saegusa* and further in view of the article entitled "IEEE 1394: A Ubiquitous Bus" (IEEE 1394). Applicants submit that independent Claims 30 and 34, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably

distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 30 is directed to a method of controlling a data communication apparatus. The method includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to send image data selected by a user to a printer via a serial bus, the image data being sent from the data communication apparatus in response to entering a send instruction into the data communication apparatus. The method also includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to inhibit, invalidate, or ignore a predetermined user instruction while the image data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer. In addition, the method includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to stop inhibiting, invalidating or ignoring the predetermined user instruction in response to disconnecting the data communication apparatus from the serial bus, while the image data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer.

Among other notable features of Claim 30 is that the predetermined user instruction is not inhibited, invalidated, or ignored in response to disconnecting the data communication apparatus from the serial bus while data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed.

Olympus relates to the user operation manual for the Olympus model D-320L and D-220L digital cameras. Apparently, these camera models may be used in conjunction with a printing device to print images from the camera. However, even if *Olympus* is deemed to discuss the operation of the digital camera while either connected or disconnected from the printer, nothing in *Olympus* discusses the operation of the camera while it is disconnected from a serial bus while data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed.

Nothing in *Olympus* is believed to teach or suggest that the predetermined user

instruction is not inhibited, invalidated, or ignored in response to disconnecting the data communication apparatus from the serial bus while data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed.

Accordingly, Claim 30 is believed to be patentable over *Olympus*, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 34 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method Claim 30, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 30.

The other claims in this application, including new Claims 40 and 41, are each dependent from Claim 30 or 34 and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2169008v1